



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,809	03/13/2000	Michael P. Murphy	686.03.498CON	6553

7590 10/22/2002

Hollie L Baker
Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

KAUSHAL, SUMESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/523,809	MURPHY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sumesh Kaushal Ph.D.	1636

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 30 September 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 15-18 and 28-30.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. Other: _____

Attachment to the Advisory Action (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): In recent response the applicant has overcome 35 USC112(2) rejection regarding "exogenous matrix component".

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 15-18 and 28-30 would stand rejected for the same reasons of record as set forth in the office action mailed on 06/17/02 and as repeated below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 15-18 and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for the same reasons of record as set forth in the official action mailed on 06/17/02.

Claims 15, 16 and 29 recite limitation "synthetic members". The metes and bounds of "synthetic members" is not clear. It is unclear what encompass "synthetic members". The applicant argues that synthetic members are used for structure or support or both. The applicant argues that a mesh member is an example that is used for the formation of tissue construct. However, this is not found persuasive because given the broadest reasonable interpretation, a synthetic member encompass any non-naturally occurring polymer and any and all types of tissue supports for example a tissue culture plate onto which the cell grown comprises a synthetic member. Therefore the metes and bounds of " synthetic members" as claimed are not clear.

Claims 15, 16 and 29 are indefinite because the metes and bounds of limitation "under conditions to produce a layer of extracellular matrix" are not clear. It is unclear what are the conditions that lead to production of an extracellular matrix in this context. The applicant argues that the specification clearly describes the medium and environmental factors that assist in the matrix synthesis. However, this is not found persuasive because the instant claims fails to recite what are the specific conditions that produce a layer of extracellular matrix components as claimed.

MPEP 2173.05(q) clearly states that attempts to claim a process without setting forth any steps involved in the process generally raises an issue of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. For example, a claim which read: "A process for using monoclonal antibodies of claim 4 to isolate and purify human fibroblast interferon." was held to be indefinite because it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced. Ex parte Erlich, 3 USPQ2d 1011 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986). Other decisions suggest that a more appropriate basis for this type of rejection is 35U.S.C. 101. In Ex parte Dunki, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App. 1967), the Board held the following claim to be an improper definition of a process: "The use of a high carbon austenitic iron alloy having a proportion of free carbon as a vehicle brake part subject to stress by sliding friction." In Clinical Products Ltd. v. Brenner, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966), the district court held the following claim was definite, but that it was not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101: "The use of a sustained release therapeutic agent in the body of ephedrine absorbed upon polystyrene sulfonic acid." Although a claim should be interpreted in light of the specification disclosure, it is generally considered improper to read limitations contained in the specification into the claims. See In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969) and In re Winkhaus, 527 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 129 (CCPA 1975), In re Van Guens, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 PSPG2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1991), which discuss the premise that one cannot rely on the specification to impart limitations to the claim that are not recited in the claim. Accordingly, without the recitation of all these critical limitations, the claims do not adequately define the instant invention.

Scott D. Priebe
SCOTT D. PRIEBE, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER